



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/550,964	09/26/2005	Junbiao Zhang	PU030103	6118
24498	7590	07/24/2008	EXAMINER	
Joseph J. Laks			MITCHELL, NATHAN A	
Thomson Licensing LLC			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2 Independence Way, Patent Operations				2617
PO Box 5312				
PRINCETON, NJ 08543				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/24/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/550,964	ZHANG ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	NATHAN MITCHELL	2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 April 2008.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 13-17 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1,4-6 and 10-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 2,3,7-9 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over 2004/0203771 A1 to Chang et al in view of 2008/0119184 A1 to Rebo et al.

For claim 1, Chang et al. disclose a communication system comprising:

A gateway (50) connected to a wired network (see fig. 1 and paragraph 23)

A plurality of access points associated with and controlled by the gateway (20a/20p) wherein each access point is configured to wireless communicate with and receive association requests from wireless clients for connection to the wired network through the access point (300) to send session information requests to the gateway in response to received association requests (302) and to process session information setting commands received from gateway (304)

wherein the gateway is configured to maintain session information that exists for each wireless client connected to the wired network through an access point associated with the gateway (302/304 and see abstract) and to respond to a session information request from a given access point by providing that access point with currently existing session information if any maintained by the gateway for the wireless client requesting association with the access point (304).

For claim 1, Chang discloses all the subject matter of the claimed invention except the session information including a session key. In an analogous art, Rebo et al. disclose session information including a session key being distributed to access points. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine this teaching with the invention as modified by incorporating the security teachings of Rebo but instead distributing the session information through a central

gateway (Chang) rather than a distributed manner. The motivation for the combination is the use of a known technique to improve a similar system in the same way.

5. Claims 6 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang et al. in view of Rebo as applied to claim 1 and further in view of 7,062,262 to Baird.

For claim 6, claim 1 discloses all the subject matter of the claimed invention with the exception of reporting session data failure if session data does not exist.

However in an analogous art, Baird discloses reporting an error message if requested information is not found in a database (240). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine this teaching with that of Chang et al. as modified by incorporating error handling into the gateway. The motivation for the combination is the use of a known technique to improve a similar device in the same way.

Claim 12 is rejected for essentially the same reason as claim 6 as it is considered implicit that the procedure of Chang et al. as modified is implemented through a computer program. The invention as modified by Baird would subsequently use a computer program as well.

6. Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang et al. in view of Rebo as applied to claim 1 and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0046179 A1 to Kokudo.

Regarding claims 4 and 5, with Chang et al. it is not clear that this extends to traffic between the access point and gateway. However Kokudo does teach encryption

being using in communication between between an access point and a gateway (paragraph 32 lines 5-6 “encrypted gateway” implies communications between access point and gateway are encrypted). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to encrypt transmissions between the access point and gateway. The motivation for doing this is to secure communications.

7. Claims 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang et al. in view of Rebo and Baird as applied to claim 6 and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0046179 A1 to Kokudo.

Regarding claims 10 and 11, with Chang et al. it is not clear that this extends to traffic between the access point and gateway. However Kokudo does teach encryption being using in communication between between an access point and a gateway (paragraph 32 lines 5-6 “encrypted gateway” implies communications between access point and gateway are encrypted). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to encrypt transmissions between the access point and gateway. The motivation for doing this is to secure communications.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NATHAN MITCHELL whose telephone number is (571)270-3117. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Lester Kincaid can be reached on (571)272-7922. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Nathan Mitchell
/Nathan Mitchell/
Examiner, Art Unit 2617
7/24/2008

/Lester Kincaid/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617